

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

November 2007

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 12, 2007

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2007 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 12, 2007" (2007). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 898.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/898

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

11/12/07

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 10/22/07 meeting by Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker shared with the Senate a situation that has come to the Provost's Office in which a transfer student came to UNI with the allowable 65 hours of transfer credit from a community college. Her GPA for those hours was about 3.85. She then did the 55 hours at UNI to complete the required 120 hours needed for graduation. Her GPA for those 55 hours here at UNI was 4.00. She is not allowed to graduate with honors because 60 hours of credit is required here to graduate with honors. However, she did not need 60 hours of credit; she had the required 120 needed for graduation. A lengthy discussion followed as to how the Senate thought this should be resolved. Whether the rule needs to be changed, exceptions made on a case by case basis, or transfer students coming into UNI need to be made more aware of the rule were all discussed.

Interim Provost Lubker continued with another concern he would like the Senate to consider. Human Resources would like it to be made clear that whenever a faculty hire is made a criminal background check is made on the person the department would like to make an offer to. This was brought to the deans, returned to Human Resources, and in the process the deans asked what other Iowa universities do. The University of Iowa does criminal background checks and Iowa State is in the process of setting up something similar. It was also discussed at the Council of Provosts meeting two weeks ago at the Board of Regents meeting. It was noted that UNI's Human Resources have suggested we do what the University of Iowa is doing. Discussion followed.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Chair Licari reported that Faculty Chair Ira Simet was not able to attend today's meeting but ask Chair Licari to inform the Senate that he will be re-starting the initiatives former Faculty Chair Joseph had been working on, Academic Rigor and Plagiarism next semester.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari noted that he attended the Board of Regents meeting held October 31 and reported that in addition to the concerns on background checks for new faculty, a 3.2% increase for instate tuition for UNI students was passed, with fees increasing 1.7% for a total increase of 3.0%.

The Regents also passed the Public Safety policy giving campuses the authorization to arm their campus police officers.

Chair Licari also noted that the Public Safety Advisory Committee met last Friday, November 9 with some information on parking being addressed. The committee focused on re-developing the Public Safety Advisory Committee to take on an over sight role for reviewing instances where campus officers use force as they will now be allowed to carry weapons once they are trained. Chair Licari serves on that committee and the Faculty Senate needs an additional representative to serve as Laura Strauss was representing the Senate but she is no longer on the Faculty Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

949 Curriculum Package Fall 2007

Chair Licari noted that senators should have a handout that was distributed before today's meeting that provides a synopsis of the changes. The rest of the information is available on-line through the email link that Dena sent out to senators this afternoon. By clicking the email link (<https://access.uni.edu/cgi-bin/ccd/curriculum/home.cgi>), you will go to the Curriculum website, with the Faculty Senator's link at the top.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #858 by Senator East; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Licari asked if there were any volunteers to serve as the Faculty Senate representative on the Public Safety Advisory Committee. A brief discussion followed.

Senator Smith asked if the Senate could talk about the recent Liberal Arts Core (LAC) curriculum issue initiated by the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) to review that program. A preliminary proposal has been circulated around campus and has caused some concern among faculty.

Senator Smith described what has happened to date, noting that it began with a request by Interim Provost Lubker to the LACC to look at the LAC, and has caused much concern among faculty. Discussion followed.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Leander Brown, department of Teaching/Educational Psychology and Foundations - Emeritus Status biography

Senator Schumacher-Douglas commented that she wanted to present a biography on Dr. Brown, which was not done at the time the Senate awarded him Emeritus Status. She briefly detailed Dr. Brown's accomplishments here at UNI.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

857 Addition of Current Courses to the Capstone Experience
Category of the LAC

The initial motion to approve the addition of current courses to the Capstone Experience category of the LAC by Senator Soneson and second by Senator Smith were withdrawn after much discussion.

Motion by Senator O'Kane to separate each course as a separate issue; second by Senator Funderburk.

Motion to approve 410:160g Community and Public Health to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Yehieli; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Motion to approve 48C:128g Ethics in Communication to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator East; second by Senator O'Kane.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve 490:106 Theatre in Education to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Funderburk. Discussion followed.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve 640:173/650:173 Bio-Medical Ethics to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Smith. Discussion followed.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve 640:194g/650:194g Perspectives on Death and Dying to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Soneson. Discussion followed.

Motion passed with one nay.

Motion to approve 740:148g Holocaust in Literature and Film to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Basom; second by Senator Soneson. Discussion followed.

Motion passed with abstention.

Motion to approve 820:150 Science, Mathematics, and Technology in the Americas to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Smith; second by Senator Basom. Discussion followed.

Motion passed with one nay.

Motion to approve 410:152g Alternative Health and Complementary Medicine to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Yehieli; second by Senator Bruess. Discussion followed.

Motion to extend the meeting five minutes by Senator VanWormer; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed with one abstention.

Motion to approve 410:152g Alternative Health and Complementary Medicine to the Capstone Experience of the LAC passed with 2 nays and 3 abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 11/12/07 1653

PRESENT: Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, David Christensen, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Paul Gray, Mary Guenther, Bev Kopper, Michael Licari, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

Ben Schafer was attending for Paul Gray.

Absent: Phil Patton, Ira Simet

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 10/22/07 meeting by Senator East; second by Senator Bruess.

There was a discussion initiated by Senator East as to the wording of the motion made by Senator Gray in regards to Item #856 Annual Report of the Military Science Liaison and Advisory Committee, 2006 - 2007. It was verified that the motion in question by Senator Gray was to "endorse" rather than "accept" the report.

Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker shared with the Senate a situation that has come to the Provost's Office in which a transfer student came to UNI with the allowable 65 hours of transfer credit from a community college. Her GPA for those hours was about 3.85. She then did the 55 hours at UNI to complete the required 120 hours needed for graduation. Her GPA for those 55 hours here at UNI was 4.00. She is not allowed to graduate with honors because 60 hours of credit is required at UNI to graduate with honors. However, she did not need 60 hours of credit; she had the required 120 needed for graduation. Interim Provost Lubker stated that he does not think that is fair but if we stick by the book she can't graduate with honors. This is a plea that has come from the student's mother, not the student.

Interim Provost Lubker asked the Senate what they thought the reaction would be if the rule was changed to fit the facts, 55 hours of credit required at UNI.

Senator East noted that we make exceptions to all sorts of rules without changing the rules, and would prefer to see an exception made rather than the rule changed.

Interim Provost Lubker then replied that once we start making exceptions then students will ask about 54 hours, or less, and when do you stop making exceptions. He stated that he would rather have a rule than make exceptions.

Senator East responded with when do we stop changing the rules?

Interim Provost Lubker noted that they will have to make a decision on this and are seeking comments. This is a student with a 4.0 at UNI and she can't get honors.

Senator Soneson commented that he imagines the rule was set at 60 to make it almost half of what the required hours for graduation used to be, 124. He can also see other situations where transfer students come in with more hours and then need fewer hours to graduate. If we did not change it to 55 hours it would be excluding those people. There are arguments both ways.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that they can make an exception in this case, but that opens the doors for other students in similar situations also asking for exceptions. When do you quit making exceptions?

Senator Neuhaus asked if this is something the Provost would like the Senate to consider in light of the proposed articulation agreements UNI will be entering in with area community colleges which will result in an increase in transfer students? Do we have an expectation of where that credit load is likely to end up if we move in that direction?

Interim Provost Lubker responded that it is likely that we will see more and more transfer students coming in with 65 hours. Sixty-five hours is what UNI requires, and it will be coming up more and more often with transfer students graduating with only 55 hours at UNI. Our rule says they have to have 60. That rule was made before the number of hours required for graduation was reduced to 120. He is asking if it would not be reasonable to reduce the number of required hours at UNI for transfer students as we reduced the total number of hours needed for graduation? If not, then that's fine and they will proceed as such.

Senator Soneson noted that he would prefer to reduce the numbers required to transfer to UNI from 65 to 60 then to decrease the number of hours needed to receive honors. Sixty hours would be half of a student's program that would have to be completed at UNI.

Associate Provost Kopper added that some the requirements that students bring in are based on our current articulation agreements between the Regent's institutions and the community colleges. We are now seeing students that are able to graduate with the reduced number of required hours. It was almost automatic that students in this situation would have 60 hours when we had higher degree requirements. Now that the degree

requirement has been reduced we are seeing students caught in this situation where they don't need the 60 hours here at UNI because they're coming in with 65 from their community college. They are caught with the articulation agreement and they are caught by the reduction in our total number of hours required for degrees.

Senator East asked if this was the Senate's rule, who has the final say?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that it is her understanding that they are bringing it forward as it is not technically a curriculum requirement. It is listed in the front of the catalog and is more of an administrative requirement. They do bring these issues to the Senate, as they are always interested in Faculty Senate input.

Interim Provost Lubker remarked that they have talked with UNI's Registrar, Phil Patton, and he's uncomfortable with making exceptions as they results in more requests for exceptions.

Associate Provost Kopper continued, asking if it's fair to make an exception for one when there may be other students in the same situation who didn't ask for exceptions. It becomes a fairness and consistency issue.

Chair Licari stated that his preference is always for rules rather than exceptions. There are others who might be eligible but are unaware, don't know or don't ask. From his standpoint if the Senate created this situation by setting up articulation agreements and dropping the required number of credits to graduate then we could also make an adjustment to meet this new demand.

Senator Neuhaus asked if there would be a possibility to create an even higher honor award for students that have taken all their hours at UNI? Something such as honors with distinction.

Senator Soneson added that it should make a difference if a student has obtained all their hours here.

Interim Provost Lubker commented that this particular student did better here at UNI than at the community college.

Senator East noted 60 hours equal two years of work. UNI has a nice wonderful thing where everybody is subject to all the rules but every rule has an exception, all a student has to do is fill

out a student request form and we can "bend" the rules. It is a reasonable request from this student but we may decide "tough" and not grant her request. One of the choices students make when they decide to go to a community college to possibly save money. UNI gives honors for work at UNI, not at the community colleges.

Senator O'Kane agrees with Senator East, and if a student is going to get honors at UNI than half of that student's education should come from UNI.

Senator Neuhaus asked if there might then be a lesser honor for those students? It could also be used in other cases but with a limit on the number of hours a student earns, such as a years worth of classes earning a 4.0.

Associate Provost Kopper added that we might want to designate on such students' transcripts such distinctions.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that they will be considering this case with the Senate's input and will let the Senate know what they decide to do.

Senator O'Kane asked if in being considered for honors, the students overall GPA from both schools is figured in?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that no, just the UNI GPA.

Senator O'Kane continued that if we bend the rules we then open the door for students that don't do so good elsewhere, maybe just enough to get in, and then doing very well here.

Associate Provost Kopper added that she has had students approach her to clarify whether their community college work would be considered, and currently it is not, only their UNI work. There is another case where a student received a 4.0 for her community college work and has a 3.92 here at UNI and asked if both GPA's would be combined. She had to tell her "no" it would only be her UNI course work. UNI is getting more transfer students and there are transfer students that do very well here and they are getting caught with this rule.

Senator Soneson asked if the information in the catalogue saying that students need two full years, 60 credits at UNI to receive honors, could be underscored so students would be more aware of it. If students are going to be here for two years they can plan to take the required number of courses per semester.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that that information is very clear in the catalogue that students need 60 hours. Students have read this information but they feel that with needing 120 hours to graduate and coming in with 55 hours, and being a 4.0 student here at UNI they can ask for an exception. In this particular situation, the student's mother is asking about her daughter, as a very good student who has been here for two years with 55 credits, can she not graduate with honors when she has a 4.0 from UNI?

Senator Soneson suggested telling the student to take an additional five more credits and get it over with.

Senator Smith suggested letting these students know as early as possible that they will need 60 hours here at UNI to be considered for honors and that they may have to go over the 120 hours required for graduation. This shouldn't be a problem for students, and they should be willing to do so if they want the designation.

Senator East commented that not all students that transfer from UNI come from "crappy" community colleges, or even excellent community colleges. Some students probably come from institutions such as Harvard and Yale, and other such places. It shouldn't matter where they're coming from when we talk about transfer students and honors.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked a point of clarification, if a student is a four-year UNI student, are they judged on their whole 120 hours here at UNI, not just the last 60?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that that is correct.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas continued that by considering this exception we're opening it up to say it's really better to go some place else for two years and come to UNI when you've refined your study habits. She would rather all students be judged on their last 60 hours unless the entire program is counted for all students.

Interim Provost Lubker continued with another concern he would like the Senate to consider. Human Resources would like it to be made clear that whenever a faculty hire is made a criminal background check is made on the person the department would like to make an offer to. Human Resources came up with this plan and

asked him to ask the deans. They were hesitant about this and made some changes and it was sent back to Human Resources. In this process the deans asked what other Iowa universities do. Iowa does criminal background checks and Iowa State is in the process of setting up something similar. At his request, this was discussed at the Council of Provosts (COPs) meeting two weeks ago. Prior to the COPs meeting he had attended a meeting out of state on legal issues in higher education. One of the attorneys at that meeting asked how many in the meeting did criminal background checks and a few indicated that they did so. He then commented that it seemed pretty "heavy handed" but that lawyers and courts are assuming educational institutions of higher education are doing criminal background checks. Parents are also assuming the universities and such are doing criminal background checks. If you go to court and haven't done a criminal background check, you're in trouble. And in this day and age we do run into cases where we wished we'd done a criminal background check.

UNI's Human Resources have suggested we do what the University of Iowa is doing, which is to make an ad for a position and when they have a number of people interested in the position they send them all a letter thanking them for their interest in the position, and saying that if you should be the person we'd offer the job to we will do a criminal background check. They enclose a release form to allow them to do so asking the interested party to sign and return it. If it is not returned they are out of the running. If they are the final choice then there is no time wasted and the release form is sent out. The process costs between \$55 and \$80, and it can be done in two to three days. This is almost identical to the process Iowa State will be initiating. UNI's Human Resources will be asked to develop something similar for our process. The people at Iowa report that this process works fine, they have had no complaints, there are no delays, and it cost very little but saves potential pain down the road. He is simply alerting the Senate to this, noting that it is unfortunate that we have to do this but this will probably be the method that we will use. This will not be done on people already here at UNI.

Senator O'Kane asked who does the deciding on the kinds of crimes once the background checks are received?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that something like an OMVI fifteen years ago would not be a problem. He believes Iowa goes seven years back and checks every county and state prospective employees have lived in. We can expect some problems and we'd

have to be very careful and reasonable about how we go about it. Some crimes such as child molestation are no-brainers.

Senator O'Kane asked who will be making that decision?

Interim Provost Lubker responded that he assumes it would be the dean of the hiring department and the provost. Iowa's policy is on their website for senators to check and he also has copies that he can make available. At Iowa State this issue came up from the faculty; at UNI it is coming down from Human Resources. UNI will probably go forward with it but would like the Senate's opinion. It is not something he is comfortable with because he's from an older generation where you trusted people.

Senator East asked if this policy will be just for faculty or for P&S staff as well?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that it's not just faculty. It is already done on almost everybody in the College of Education.

Senator Yehieli asked if the main concern is child molestation, sexual predator types of crimes?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that that is a main concern. He also noted that discussion has not gone far enough to consider various scenarios such as an applicant who served time a substantial number of years ago for a major crime. It does have to be considered though.

Chair Licari asked if these types of things are spelled out in Iowa's policy, and noted that it would be useful if the Senate could have copies of Iowa's policy.

Senator Wurtz asked if the position requires handling of budgetary funds, would they also look at financial responsibility? She is surprised to find out that we have not been doing this because it is a standard in business.

Interim Provost Lubker will provide the Senate with Iowa's website where their policy is posted. He noted that they also have a list of job responsibilities that would trigger a background check. Iowa State is also thinking about doing this and we should also. There is such a long list that you think why not just do it on everyone and get it over with, as you don't know how someone's job is going to change once they get on campus.

Senator Yehieli asked approximately how many people UNI hires each year?

Interim Provost Lubker responded that this year there's about 35-40 hires but this is a good year. Usually it's about 20-30, not too many to break the bank.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked if this is just a name search? She noted that students in the College of Education wanting to become teachers are subjected to fingerprinting. What extent will it go to?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that he didn't know. He did note that one thing UNI does not do enough of that is on the books is a background check on academic credentials. We have missed that step a lot.

Dr. Francis Degnin, Philosophy and Religion, asked if something does come up on a background check, will that person be allowed to respond? Something such as a sexual molestation charge when they were 18 with a 16 year old, or they got on the Homeland Security list, which is almost impossible to get off of.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that he thought they'd be allowed to confess. This brings up something else that many universities do, and that is including a request for "self reporting" any criminal convictions a person may have.

Senator Yehieli asked if this includes just criminal charges or also judgments such as bankruptcies or foreclosures against a person?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that yes, managing money and managing or having access to software, and the ability to do things in the software system, those are all issues that would need to be investigated.

Senator Wurtz suggested inviting UNI's Human Resources to discuss this with us. There is a body of professional practice; laws that apply, use of credit reports, the opportunity for challenging the information, and the Human Resources professionals know this.

Interim Provost Lubker suggested letting Nick Bambach, Director, UNI's Human Resources, have an opportunity to respond to the things he will be asking him about what's going on at Iowa and

Iowa State before inviting him to present information to the Senate.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Chair Licari reported that Faculty Chair Ira Simet was not able to attend today's meeting but ask Chair Licari to inform the Senate that he will be re-starting the initiatives former Faculty Chair Joseph had been working on, Academic Rigor and Plagiarism. He is finishing up some meetings with Dr. Joseph and plans to begin the discussion in the spring.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari noted that he attended the Board of Regents meeting held October 31. In addition to the concerns on background checks for new faculty, a 3.2% increase for instate tuition for UNI students was passed, with fees increasing 1.7% for a total increase of 3.0%.

The Regents passed the Public Safety policy giving campuses the authorization to arm their campus police officers.

The Public Safety Advisory Committee met last Friday, November 9 with some information on parking being addressed. Additional handicap parking places have been added to the Baker lot as a result of removing some of the meters there.

The committee focused on re-developing the Public Safety Advisory Committee to take on an over sight role for reviewing instances where campus officers use force, now that they are allowed to carry weapons once they have been trained. Chair Licari serves on that committee and the Faculty Senate needs an additional representative to serve as Laura Strauss had served but she is no longer on the Faculty Senate.

As Chair of the Faculty Senate, Chair Licari wants to make sure that the Senate is comfortable with him serving on this committee. As there were no dissenting comments, Chair Licari will continue to serve on the Public Safety Advisory Committee. The need for an additional Faculty Senate representative will be addressed under "New Business."

Senator East asked Chair Licari what his role on the Public Safety Advisory Committee is.

Chair Licari responded that he was a member of that committee prior to being elected Chair of the Faculty Senate, and he does not serve as chair of that committee.

Senator Yehieli asked how frequently the committee meets.

Chair Licari replied that they have not meet regularly in the past but they will be meeting more frequently to gear up for the new role the committee will be taking on as an over sight committee when weapons are used by Public Safety officers. They may be meeting weekly for the next few months.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

949 Curriculum Package Fall 2007

Chair Licari noted that senators should have a handout that was distributed before today's meeting that provides a synopsis of the changes. The rest of the information is available on-line through the email link that Dena sent out to senators this afternoon (<https://access.uni.edu/cgi-bin/ccd/curriculum/home.cgi>). He did check that link out and it does work, giving Faculty Senate Senator's an opportunity to go through the entire Curriculum Package. By clicking the email link, you will go to the Curriculum website, with the Faculty Senator's link at the top.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #858 by Senator East; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Licari asked if there were any volunteers to serve as the Faculty Senate representative on the Public Safety Advisory Committee.

In response to Senator Funderburk question as to when the committee meets, Chair Licari responded that they met last Friday at 1:00 p.m. and will meet again this Friday at 1:00. The meeting times however are negotiable if committee members have a conflict.

In response to Senator Yehieli's comment about not being able to meet every week due to her schedule, Chair Licari stated that

the committee does have a fair amount work involved in figuring out how to proceed with the over sight role.

Senator Funderburk asked about the diversity make-up of committee members. Noting that this relates to the Senate's discussion earlier this fall about the impact of Public Safety Officer's bearing of arms on the campus population, which is both ethnically and racially diverse.

Chair Licari replied that the committee is not diverse but there is good gender representation.

In response to Senator O'Kane's question if the new representative needs to be a Senator, Chair Licari responded, yes.

Senator Smith asked if the Senate could talk about the recent Liberal Arts Core (LAC) curriculum issue initiated by the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) to review that program. A preliminary proposal has been circulated around campus and has caused some concern among faculty.

Senator Smith described what has happened to date, noting that it began with a request by Interim Provost Lubker to the LACC to look at the LAC. There were no instructions in terms of what to be done, he just felt it was time for it to be looked at and noted that he would be open to suggestions. At that time Siobahn Morgan, LACC Coordinator, asked for representatives from the LACC to serve on this sub-committee that would review the LAC and make recommendations back to the LACC. He agreed to serve on that committee, as did Dr. Morgan, as well as several other non-faculty members who routinely meet with the LACC. This sub-committee has been meeting now for over a year and has developed a preliminary proposal, which they brought forward to the LACC for discussion, seeking guidance and support. That preliminary proposal was distributed electronically across campus to many people, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and most of the deans, and others. There has been a lot of concern expressed over this preliminary proposal.

He raises this issue because he feels that several of the concerns need to be addressed. First, he has heard that the "design team" or committee is really trying to "railroad" or "ramrod" it through and going outside normal curriculum procedures. That could not be further from the truth. The committee was formed by the LACC, and they are going back

committee was formed by the LACC, and they are going back through the LACC with their proposal. Ultimately, anything done by the LACC would have to be approved by the Faculty Senate, which is the normal curriculum process. There is no attempt to go around or circumvent the normal procedures.

Senator Smith stated that another concern was raised which might be more substantive. This is the concern that the "design team" only had two faculty and three non-faculty members serving and whether or not there was enough faculty representation on the committee was raised. Dr. Morgan asked for volunteers to serve on the committee and at that time no one volunteered. At the time that this committee was formed there were a number of new faculty members serving on the LACC, and they didn't really know much about it. Many of the more experienced LACC members were very busy and didn't have the time to devote to something such as this. They were aware that anything that the "design team" did would come back through the LACC. A majority of the proposal came from the faculty serving on the "design team." At this point, it seems that to criticize the proposal on the grounds of where it came from, not enough faculty representation, is really an example of what is called a "genetic fallacy." They are arguing against the source rather than the proposal. The proposal should be evaluated on its merits.

Senator Smith continued, noting that the committee did meet informally with faculty, with the meeting times being publicized, prior to the proposal being developed. There will be many more meetings coming up, with college senators and open forums where any faculty can contribute. Any faculty at any time can offer a proposal for revising the LAC; it can be done by anybody at any time. This committee has a proposal on the table that they think is worth consideration. Faculty will be receiving a copy of the proposal prior to the end of the semester. The formal meetings will continue next semester. He will be happy to meet and talk about the proposal with anyone who wishes to do so. He is hoping to dispel some of what can almost be described as "hysteria" over this proposal in some parts of the campus. It is totally unjustified and unfair to the people that worked on the committee. It is a very good proposal and deserves a lot of attention. When it is discussed, he hopes it can be discussed with an eye towards what's in the best interest of our students, and the university, and get past the other concerns.

described. The idea behind the "design team" as a sub-committee of the LACC was to come forward with something the LACC could discuss. The idea was that the LACC as a faculty committee would look at the proposal prior it going out to a broader audience. However, it went out before it had been reviewed by the LACC so the faculty committee that was charged with reviewing it didn't have a chance to review it before there was hysteria by some of the people who saw the proposal. Some people on campus saw the proposal before she did, and as an LACC member she informed them that the proposal had not yet been reviewed by the LACC.

Chair Licari thanked Senator Smith and noted that the Senate will look forward to those discussions next semester.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Leander Brown, department of Teaching/Educational Psychology and Foundations - Emeritus Status biography

Chair Licari stated that additional information has come forward on the Emeritus Status of Leander Brown.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas commented that she wanted to present a biography on Dr. Brown, which was not done at the time the Senate awarded him Emeritus Status.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted Dr. Leander Brown began teaching at UNI in 1970 and retired in 2007. During his 37 years at UNI, he taught Field Experience: Exploring Teaching, the Dynamics of Human Development, Psychology of Adolescence, and Current Approaches to Multicultural Education. Dr. Brown served as a University Affirmative Action Reviewer from 1982 to 1983, and he also served as the Interim Affirmative Action Coordinator during the 1987-1988 academic year. Dr. Brown has begun to gather documentation and is writing "The History of the Racial Integration of Price Lab School." He was a counselor at Price Lab School when the initial transition to racial integration took place and he continues to work on this project throughout his retirement.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

857 Addition of Current Courses to the Capstone Experience
Category of the LAC

857 Addition of Current Courses to the Capstone Experience
Category of the LAC

Motion to approve the addition of current courses to the Capstone Experience category of the LAC by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Smith.

Senator Soneson remarked that these look like good courses.

Senator East stated, as one currently proposing a Capstone course, he was disappointed in the amount of information he received. As a faculty proposing a Capstone course, he was asked for and submitted a lot of information, even after submitting information he was again asked for more. He was quite disappointed in what he received. He assumes that the current committee must differ from the committee when these courses were first proposed several years ago.

Senator East also noted he has a concern about the Senate doing the faculty's business in private. The information he received, as best he can tell, is not available to any one who is not on the Senate. He went to the UNI Senate web page and found nothing, and while the agenda is on the web there is no information about these courses there. It seems that if the Senate is going to do the faculty's business the faculty should have a chance to see what business it is we're doing. In this case they have not; there is not a list available to the faculty as to what courses are being proposed to be added to the Capstone category. This information, as best he can tell, is not available in any mechanism through the Senate's information. It may be available through Capstone but he didn't look there. It needs to be available through the Senate's pages. He believes that the Senate should not consider this today.

Dr. Morgan, LACC Coordinator, responded that in terms of the information provided to the Senate, she submitted the proposals. In some cases syllabi were included with the proposals that were extensive, some included syllabi of other courses that they taught and did not include that specific course. If she had included all that information there would have been a very large volume of information. What was provided is similar to what you would see in a curriculum packet proposal for the University Curriculum Committee (UCC); the outline of the course, the purpose and goals. She was trying to conserve some paperwork. It is probably true that the vetting process got more sophisticated as time went on. If a course was proposed early on, yes, they did gather much more information, considering many

options. The committee became more sophisticated in their evaluation process as time went on. She doesn't want Senator East to feel as though he was picked on, but the committee picked on quite a few faculty.

Dr. Morgan added that she can understand why it does look like it is covert, in that it doesn't list the courses being proposed. She has mentioned at the LAC meeting that this was to be addressed at the Faculty Senate and the courses that would be addressed.

Senator East responded that this has nothing to do with the LAC; it's how the Senate does business. He feels that we need not do business that way, and the Senate needs to start sometime.

Dr. Morgan added that if more information on any of these courses is need, she does have additional information that she can provide anyone who requests it. If it is a currently taught course, senators can always contact the instructor as some of these courses are taught every semester. These courses are among the most popular courses and they fill up faster then the "old" Capstone courses, Environment, Technology and Society. She checked this morning and almost all of these new experimental Capstone courses were filled for spring.

Chair Licari asked if the source of Senator East's issue is the fact that a faculty member would not be able to know which courses were being considered right here, right now?

Senator East replied that this arose from the Senate's action at the last meeting where the Senate passed a policy related to program length. The fact that we were considering a policy was on the agenda but the content of the policy was not available for faculty to look at, examine, and perhaps complain to their senator's about. The same thing has now happened with this; the rest of the faculty need to see what we are doing, not just see that we're doing something but to see what we are doing seems to him to be not good. This kind of information needs to be available in paper files or on the web or somehow so that any interested faculty member can get that information.

Chair Licari stated that this is how it works right now. If faculty are very interested in the Capstone Experience of the LAC, and they see that it has been docketed they can contact their senate representative or himself, or Faculty Senate Secretary, Dena Snowden, to get the information.

Senator East continued, how do faculty know that they can do that; it's not in the message that goes out, for more information contact Chair Licari.

Chair Licari responded that that can be easily added, but the presumption would be that someone would be smart enough to know to ask.

Senator East continued, stating that the Senate needs to be operating in the open.

Chair Licari stated that he has no problem with transparency but there does need to be some kind of limit on the amount of paperwork that goes to the entire campus because 95% of it goes in the trash. It probably works best to stick with what we have and if someone is very interested in knowing more about a particular issue the Senate dockets; they will contact their representative. The fact that it's not happening might simply be an indication that nobody's that interested.

Senator Mvuyekure commented on course 740:148G Holocaust in Literature and Film, noting that this is personal to him. One of the objectives is to heighten students' sensitivity to racial issues, culture differences and tolerance. The Holocaust was initially used to describe the genocide of the Jewish people, but he would hate to see this course miss opportunities to address other instances of genocide around the world. That would be a great missed opportunity and he doesn't see that here.

Senator Soneson replied that he did not believe that that was the intent of this course. The intent of the course is to discuss the Nazi Holocaust. Also a good course would be Holocaust in the World Today, but that would be a different course than this. The course as it is offered has its own integrity, and while its title is "The Holocaust", in general that is what people identify the Nazi Holocaust with.

Senator Mvuyekure added that he does know that the Nazi Holocaust has been serving as guideline to the international court. Everything that happens in terms of genocide, you always have to go back to the Holocaust. Personally he sees it as a tragedy to not link the Nazi Holocaust to other cases of genocide. He would also like the course to link to contemporary issues in terms of genocide.

Dr. Morgan noted that this course originally came out of the Modern Languages Department as an elective for German majors, and is intended as a course for that specific group. She agrees that it would be wonderful to get someone to develop a course dealing with post-1995 or pre-1935 genocides. She would like to encourage development of topical courses such as that. If any one has a great idea for a course they should see her. This is the case of a current course that had a specific audience and need as an elective in a major.

Senator East stated that he has difficulty seeing in these proposals something "capstonish." Many of them look like courses designed for majors which were called Capstone to fill them up. It bothers him. The Holocaust course was a major's course; the math course looks like a majors course. He does not see the "Capstone" in it, the interdisciplinary in it. He sees people mouthing interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary without actually doing it. He doesn't see them going outside the original content; do they, how do we know they do?

Dr. Morgan responded that one of the things they track is the student population in these courses, what are their majors.

Senator East continued that as soon as we say they're Capstone everybody wants them because they don't to take that science Capstone course. Being popular has nothing to do with are they meeting the goals of the Capstone.

Dr. Morgan stated that by having students that are non-majors take these courses they're out of their comfort zone; they're not taking courses from their regular faculty in their major. There's a wider student population and the input from wider student populations offers different perspectives. That's one of the things that they are watching.

Senator East continued that the Capstone experience comes from the content not the students presumably.

Dr. Morgan replied that in a way, yes, but that the students can contribute to the course. They also try to keep the courses as interactive as possible so students aren't just sitting listening to lectures. They have out put in terms of multiple papers, projects, and presentations. They avoid having lectures and tests.

Senator East questioned if making students write papers makes it Capstone?

Dr. Morgan responded that no, but they also have discussions, and whether they actually go and do that is up to the students. They do encourage those interactive activities in the proposals.

Senator Smith stated that he is sympathetic in a sense, noting that he was on the LACC when the new Capstone Experience was developed. At that time they had some models of what real Capstones looked like. We would have liked to have gotten courses that followed those models, and still would but we just can't get many of those in terms of proposals from faculty. While we still feel that that is a good requirement, many of the courses here don't fit that traditional notion of Capstone. In a sense we've broadened our notion of Capstone, to be a course that does something that is interdisciplinary, it's not in a major because you can't have prerequisites that are in a major of these courses. They get students from many different bodies and it does something valuable in their education that maybe wasn't covered in the rest of the LAC. We feel that we have something that fills in some of the gaps or cracks, courses that add to a student's undergraduate experience in a way that can't be covered by the other categories. It does serve a useful purpose but Senator East is right, this does not meet the traditional notion of Capstone across the board, not by a long shot.

Senator Soneson commented that he assumes there is a list of criteria for approval of the new Capstone Experience courses. And if someone proposes a course such as this they have to write a statement about how this meets the criteria. If an additional statement on how this course would stick to the Capstone criteria other than a short syllabus could be offered to us it would be helpful. It would be helpful to have the criteria and then review the statements, seeing how these courses fit the criteria.

Dr. Morgan replied that the criteria was approved by the Senate three years ago and included that it would be appealing to a wide range of students, possibly including a community or outreach based experience, multidisciplinary, make use of the students' skills that they have developed throughout their LAC experience, problem solving. When a proposal is made, faculty making the proposal are invited to the LACC where they are asked about their course, questions that are not answered by the proposal. Information on how those questions are answered are not in the LACC's notes so she's not able to provide that

information. However, the faculty who proposed the courses could do so.

Dr. Morgan also noted that she would not feel comfortable writing those statements but some of the instructors of these classes are here today.

Senator Neuhaus commented that he's not very familiar with courses in the LAC, and asked if they receive more applications for courses than are approved?

Dr. Morgan replied that these are courses that currently exist in the curriculum, and the other courses in the New Capstone Experience are brand new courses.

Senator Smith, responding to Senator Neuhaus, stated that in his experience on the LACC the approval rate on proposed Capstone courses was 80-90%. They have good criteria but that it's hard to tell from the proposal what's going to be delivered. Over time they did raise the expectations for Capstone. Given the information limitations, we're being asked to accept the LACC's judgment in approving these courses but the Senate can get more information on the courses if they need to.

Senator O'Kane asked if these courses would pass the current Capstone requirements?

Dr. Morgan responded that personally she doesn't have any problems with any of these courses. The student feedback on these courses are very positive.

Senator Basom added that based on her experience, what she has seen and heard about them, yes, they would pass the current Capstone requirements. Because they have been taught several times faculty would be able to provide details, and the faculty that are teaching these courses are aware of that interdisciplinary nature.

Senator East stated that he was concerned about the fact that some of these courses have numerous faculty who might teach these course; some with many, some with just a few, some as consultant's, and one with just one. He would be nervous about a Capstone course that is in the catalogue and taught by just one faculty and not supported by other faculty. Were that one faculty member to leave tomorrow, that course would still count as Capstone and any other faculty member could teach it as they desired. There's a notion of department buy-in that concerns

him as well. In many cases a faculty member comes up with a course they like and to keep peace within the department the department signs off on it as well as at the college level and Faculty Senate level. It's often a rubber stamp process. He's not concerned about a department rubber-stamping a course but he has to vote on this and his conscious works a little differently.

Dr. Morgan replied that this is the mission raised with the new Capstone courses because for the most part they are taught by one faculty. But that is also an issue that can be raised with any major's course. It has been the case with some of the new Capstone courses not going forward because faculty have left or are not willing to teach it any more. The LACC is currently working on a Capstone management guideline; to manage the Capstone courses and keep them on track as the kind of course they would like it to be in case there are changes in instructors.

Chair Licari reiterated the motion to approve this set of Capstone Experience courses.

Discussion followed with the Senate being informed that there were two letters sent to the Senate listing the courses, which are copied, front and back in the information.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked, as a new Senate member, if Capstone courses can be taken by anyone as either a junior or a senior, and by someone either in that major or not in that major?

Chair Licari responded that yes, they can.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas continued so students aren't pushed to go out and explore areas other than their majors in Capstone, they are allowed to remain in their area of comfort.

Senator Neuhaus noted that one of the health courses stated that it would put a cap on majors in the course.

Dr. Susan Roberts-Dobie, HPELS, instructor of 410:160 Community and Public Health, responded that if students take the introductory course 410:005 they cannot earn credit for the Capstone course. Because of that she's had one student opt out of the introductory course and take the Capstone course instead. Other than that, her classroom has been full of students looking for Capstone credit. It is self-limiting because by the time

students get to the level where they can register for Capstone, these specialty Capstone courses fill up very quickly. Students have to be seniors to be able to register for them and students want to take their major courses early and if they take the intro course as a junior they no longer need to take this Capstone course.

Dr. Morgan added that with the Capstone management effort the issue of preventing only majors from taking a Capstone course is to cross reference these courses under 010: and blocking seats for a limited number of majors.

Senator East asked how can a course be counted as a major course and be interdisciplinary?

Dr. Morgan replied that it would be as an elective.

Senator East reiterated his question, how can a course be counted as a major course and be interdisciplinary? For example, one of his Computer Science course, by definition it's not interdisciplinary.

Senator Soneson suggested the Philosophy of Computer Science.

Dr. Morgan suggested the History of Computer Science.

Senator East responded that the History of Computer Science is more of a Computer Science course than a history course.

Dr. Morgan added that she took a course, Computers in Society.

Chair Licari interrupted, reiterating the motion to approve the slate of proposed Capstone Experience courses.

Senator O'Kane noted that at the last meeting it was agreed that the Senate would vote individually on each course.

Chair Licari responded that it was not agreed on, it had been a question of whether or not the Senate was able to do so but that was not the motion that had been made.

Point of order was made by Senator Funderburk.

Motion by Senator O'Kane to separate each course as a separate issue; second by Senator Funderburk.

Associate Provost Kopper added the one of the explicit criteria that was not included in the Capstone Model but is important to note is the passion and expertise that the faculty and instructors bring to these courses. It is one of the things that's important to recognize about the new Capstone model. While it's not listed, what those faculty bring to this experience is something very positive for our students and is something that has to be brought forward as these courses are considered.

Senator Soneson withdrew his previous motion to the addition of current courses to the Capstone Experience category of the LAC. The second was also withdrawn by Senator Smith.

Motion to approve 410:160g Community and Public Health to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Yehieli; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Motion to approve 48C:128g Ethics in Communication to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator East; second by Senator O'Kane.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve 490:106 Theatre in Education to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Funderburk.

Senator East asked if the multidisciplinary in this course comes from theatre in education?

Dr. Morgan replied that it also comes from what they do in this course. This is one of the few Capstone courses that is an actual outreach course where they take programs to schools, they teach students how to do plays for schools on which critical issues are based such as the DARE program. They learn about how to provide the education and entertainment components to that, the logistics of scheduling those kinds of things, dealing with social issues as well as theatre in education.

Senator East asked if this course is taken by non-majors?

Dr. Morgan responded that there are music majors enrolled as well as other non-theatre and non-education majors; accounting majors are in all of these proposed Capstone courses.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve 640:173/650:173 Bio-Medical Ethics to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Smith.

Senator East asked about the course activities, noting that he liked the objectives but there seems to be little or no information about what the students actually do.

Dr. Francis Degnin, course instructor, responded, noting that it had been his understanding that the course didn't have to offer every single objective but could provide a variety. This course is very multi-disciplinary beginning with plays, dealing with legal issues, economic issues, business ethics, a wide variety of material comes into play with this course. It goes deep into the area of bio-medical ethics and focusing a lot on critical thinking; how do students learn to think critically and see both sides of an issue.

Senator East reiterated his question, what do students do?

Dr. Degnin replied that students have approximately 12 short writing assignments based on their views which are turned in online before class discussion which he reviews prior to class discussion so he knows what they're thinking beforehand, they can hand in one to two major papers, they have two exams which are the breadth of the topic with every thing else focusing on the depth. There is also class participation and they can receive extra credit for going to various lectures on or off campus. Students are also allowed to re-write their papers for practice in improving their writing.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve 640:194g/650:194g Perspectives on Death and Dying to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator East noted that he has trouble seeing the multidisciplinary in this course; it seems like a philosophy course. And life long learning of what?

Dr. Degnin responded that this is the course he is proudest of, noting that he gets letters from students every semester about how this course has impacted their life. The course has elements similar to Bio-Medical Ethics, such as the writing. It also has a component where students have to go out and spend time in either a nursing home, hospice or at a funeral home.

Senator East commented that he did read what the students did and liked that. His question is how is this multidisciplinary? This sounds like a philosophy course.

Dr. Degnin replied that they read literature, discuss legal issues, look at the psychological component in dealing with grief, investigate the philosophical component in terms of the students' lifestyle and traditions, as well as the religious component.

Senator East continued that there is another requirement of Capstone that it focus on life long learning. Life long learning of what here?

Dr. Degnin responded that there are really two themes with this course. The first being learning how to die, or when faced with the question of death, do you know how to live. One of the themes that runs through the whole course is what does it mean to live facing the possibility of death.

Senator VanWormer added that this course fits in very well with Social Work and really liked it.

Motion passed with one nay.

Motion to approve 740:148g Holocaust in Literature and Film to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Basom; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Neuhaus stated that he agrees with what Senator Mvuyekure mentioned earlier, noting that he hadn't notice then that this was a language course and thinks that it is a brilliant class because of that. It would be good if they would tackle that issue on a larger scale, including more on other genocides through out history, and they could make it a good

multidisciplinary, challenging course, both from a historical and current perspective. It is a desperately important topic.

Motion passed with abstention.

Motion to approve 820:150 Science, Mathematics, and Technology in the Americas to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Smith; second by Senator Basom.

Senator East noted that the primary instructor is Dr. Joel Haack, who is no longer teaching.

Chair Licari stated that this course hasn't been taught for the last three to four years.

Dr. Haack commented that Dr. Tom Hockey, Earth Science, and other faculty that were part of the course when he taught it have expressed interest in teaching it depending on staffing availabilities.

Senator Soneson asked Dr. Haack if he was still interested in having the Senate approve this course, is this something that the College of Natural Science has an intention of offering on a regular basis?

Dr. Haack responded that he would enjoy seeing it offered again, and it was a very good experience for the people who had been involved in it, and it was a very good experience for the students in the course.

Senator O'Kane remarked that it seems to him that we should be suggesting courses that are intended to be taught.

Senator Funderburk added that this seems like an opportune moment to point out again that this is an unfounded mandate, that we don't have enough faculty to staff the courses that we are offering already, with the great hope that eventually somebody from on high will drop money down so we can do this. There are some great things we could be offering if we had people here to do it.

Dr. Haack noted that this course met the guidelines at the time it was approved, and it's a course that he would like to see offered again. It was a good course for the students and there are a lot of courses that are on the books that are offered infrequently, and this course happens to be one of them.

Senator Soneson asked how many times this course was offered, noting that it can be offered three times without it being approved in this manner.

Dr. Haack responded that it is already a course on the books with the College of Natural Science.

Chair Licari added that all of these courses being discussed today are courses that are already on the books.

Dr. Haack commented that the question is whether it should carry the Capstone designation.

Senator Basom stated that this is clearly an interdisciplinary course, in particular that it looks at the contributions of diverse populations in the Americas. It is different than many of the other courses we've approved, and it clearly meets the Capstone guidelines.

Motion passed with one nay.

Motion to approve 410:152g Alternative Health and Complementary Medicine to the Capstone Experience of the LAC by Senator Yehieli; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator O'Kane stated that he has several concerns; it is in fact multidisciplinary and homeopathy is not a science, it doesn't work, and why faith healing and cupping, and such are not included?

Senator Yehieli responded that those are all considered to be traditional health practices. These are common practices among many diverse populations, immigrants, and refugees in the United States. It is a multidisciplinary course in that it is not clinical medicine but approaches. The course involves the Public Health standpoint and by definition is multidisciplinary.

Senator O'Kane added that it is not really a health course; it's more of a sociological historical course.

Senator Yehieli replied that yes, it is and that's okay. It's not clinical medicine, which would have a narrower focus.

Dr. Morgan also added that one of the courses that will be brought forward in the Curriculum Package at the next meeting is

Science and Pseudo-Science, a way to help people understand what is behind some of this, whether a cultural or ignorance background. It's a more informational course and not trying to convert students.

Senator O'Kane reiterated that it is very much evidence based, in that homeopathy is shown that it does not work.

Senator Yehiele responded that in the courses they go through different kinds of alternative and complementary health practices and talk about the pros and cons, discussing information or evidence towards that.

Dr. Morgan remarked that the textbook that is given for the course is written by a Ph.D./M.D. from the Thomas Jefferson University, and does include evidence-based approaches focusing on treatments best supported by clinical trials and scientific evidence.

Senator East noted that there was not much information provided for him to judge anything about it. It doesn't talk about how multidisciplinary it is; that Public Health is multidisciplinary by nature is a nice statement but it doesn't explain. Looking at this proposal he has very little information, no information about what students do, and he's uncomfortable in just trusting faculty to do good things. This one seems more than many to do that.

Senator Soneson asked if it would be possible for the Senate to invite the instructor here to discuss our concerns. On the surface it does not look like a university course, it looks like a community-based discussion topic. It's not that we have objection to it, there can be a good historical, philosophical, and sociological analysis of what's out there but what he's hearing is people asking for information to indicate that the course is like that. When he first read it he thought it was a course where he'd learn how to get into homeopathy, looking a little bit like a "how to" course with some of the language even suggesting that.

Senator Yehieli commented that this has been one of the most requested classes within the Health division at UNI. But with budget cuts it has not always been taught because it is an elective.

Chair Licari stated that before moving forward the Senate needs a motion to extend the meeting time, as it is 5:00.

Motion to extend the meeting five minutes by Senator VanWormer; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed with one abstention.

Senator Smith asked Dr. Morgan if some of the issues that are being raised here today came up during discussion in front of the LACC.

Dr. Morgan responded that questions were raised, whether this was something like Senator Soneson alluded to, a "how to" course. This is a timely course with these various modalities being brought up in our culture today. This allows students to evaluate these types of therapies and practices from a critical, science/health-based, knowledge-based view and that is one of the things that is listed in the course description. The LACC was very comfortable with that.

Senator VanWormer stated that this sounds like a very excellent courses and urged the Senate to approve it.

Senator Neuhaus noted that this course could attract students that are trying to stay away from the rigor of science by the very things that the Senate has treated lightly, homeopathy and such. This may bring students seeking to avoid rigor to become enlightened by the multidisciplinary aspect of it.

Senator Wurtz stated that in reviewing the course objectives students will have to be a historian, will have to understand the methods of science, will have to understand fundamentals of psychology, will have to have some practical "how to", will have to have some economics; it seems awfully multidisciplinary to her.

Motion passed with 2 nays and 3 abstentions.

OTHER DISCUSSION

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Soneson to adjourn; second by Senator Yehieli. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

To view the University of Iowa's Criminal Background Check at
Point of Hire go to
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/09.htm#93>